DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 419 086 CE 076 049

AUTHOR Gabor, Stanley C.; Heggan, Jon P.
TITLE The Off-Campus Center: Extending the Reach of Higher Education. Organizational Issues.
INSTITUTION National Univ. Continuing Education Association, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 1995-06-00
NOTE 46p.
AVAILABLE FROM National University Continuing Education Association, One Dupont Circle, NW, Suite 615, Washington, DC 20036-1168; phone: 202-659-3130; fax: 202-785-0374 ($10).
PUB TYPE Guides - Non-Classroom (055)
EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Students; *Continuing Education; Distance Education; Educational Quality; Educational Research; *Educational Trends; *Extension Education; *Higher Education; Marketing; *Off Campus Facilities; Outreach Programs; Program Development; *Program Implementation; Shared Facilities

ABSTRACT

Based on a study of basic organizational issues typically encountered in opening, managing, and closing an off-campus center (OCC), this monograph is designed for colleges and universities wishing to explore the possibility of creating or expanding an OCC for adult students. The definition of an OCC is provided. After a brief statistical overview of location, enrollment, and physical characteristics of OCCs, survey results are used to address key issues. Issue 1, the decision to establish an OCC, discusses facts that influence the decision, local/state political considerations, changing demographics, and gift of land. Issue 2, start-up of an OCC, addresses site selection; rental, ownership, and other arrangements; space sharing; and staffing. Issue 3, marketing of an OCC, looks at market assessment activities, initial awareness campaign, and marketing strategy. Issue 4 includes structural and operational issues such as the following: relationship to the main campus, accreditation, financial self-sufficiency, library services and personnel, student services, advisory boards, technology, microcomputer labs, and technology in the future. A section on problems associated with OCCs focuses on the issue of quality and why centers close. The final section looks at trends, including enhancing urban communities, exploring alternative delivery modes, and expanding strategic alliances. Appendixes contain the methodology, list of responding institutions, and annotated listing of 21 references. (YLB)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED 419 086

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S Goewey

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

# THE OFF-CAMPUS CENTER

## Extending the Reach of Higher Education

Stanley C. Gabor ▪ Jon P. Heggan



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

# THE OFF-CAMPUS CENTER

## Extending the Reach of Higher Education

Stanley C. Gabor • Jon P. Heggan

nuces
NATIONAL
UNIVERSITY
CONTINUING
EDUCATION
ASSOCIATION

**THE OFF-CAMPUS CENTER**
By Stanley C. Gabor and Jon P. Heggan

**Copyright © 1995:** National University Continuing Education Association. All Rights Reserved.

**Publication date:** June 1995

**Price:** $10 (less 20% discount for NUCEA members), plus shipping.

**Copies may be ordered** by contacting NUCEA at the address below.

nucea

**National University Continuing Education Association**
One Dupont Circle, Suite 615 • Washington, DC 20036-1168
202/659-3130 • fax: 202/785-0374

## About NUCEA

The National University Continuing Education Association (NUCEA) was founded in 1915 to promote excellence and expanded opportunities in continuing higher education. The Association's some 420 member institutions offer both degree and non-degree instruction at the pre- and post-baccalaureate levels to part-time students. NUCEA's membership encompasses accredited, degree-granting colleges and universities, as well as comparable non-profit organizations having a substantial involvement in continuing higher education.

Through its diverse activities, the Association works to:

- ensure part-time students' access to higher education;
- foster the development of continuing higher education programs that address diverse constituencies' occupational and intellectual needs;
- facilitate access to knowledge and practices that can enhance teaching, learning, and effective program administration; and
- support the interests of continuing higher education before relevant legislative, regulatory, and policymaking bodies.

NUCEA seeks to exemplify its commitment to ethnic, cultural, and gender diversity and fairness in all of its forums, both public and private.

## About the Authors

**Stanley C. Gabor** is dean of the School of Continuing Studies at Johns Hopkins University, which he joined from New York University in 1982. In the past decade, he has established or expanded four off-campus centers between Baltimore and Washington, D.C. at which master's degree programs are offered in business, education, and the liberal arts. He is co-author of "A National Policy for Quality in Off-Campus Degree Programs" (1988) for the Council of Graduate Schools. Gabor has been active in NUCEA on various committees and task forces, as well as workshops and publications. He holds undergraduate, graduate (American History), and juris doctorate degrees from New York University.

**Jon P. Heggan** is senior associate dean in the School of Continuing Studies of Johns Hopkins University, which he joined from the University of Delaware in 1987. His principal areas of responsibility include oversight of finance and budget, administrative computing, off-campus centers, student services, institutional research, and human resources. Heggan is a past chairperson of both the Division of Business, Industry and Labor and the Council for Continuing Education, and served a two-year term on NUCEA's Board of Directors. He did his undergraduate work at the University of Delaware in political science, and received his Ph.D. from the University of Illinois in political science.

# Table of Contents

**Foreward** . . . . . vi

**Preface** . . . . . vii

**Introduction** . . . . . 1

Definition of an Off-Campus Center . . . . . 2

**Location, Enrollments, and Physical Characteristics** . . . . . 3

**The Decision to Establish an Off-Campus Center** . . . . . 7

**Start-Up of an Off-Campus Center** . . . . . 10

Selection of the Site . . . . . 10

Rental, Ownership, and Other Arrangements . . . . . 10

Space Sharing . . . . . 11

Staffing . . . . . 12

**Marketing an Off-Campus Center** . . . . . 14

**Structural and Operational Issues** . . . . . 16

Relationship to the Main Campus . . . . . 16

Accreditation . . . . . 17

Financial Self-Sufficiency . . . . . 18

Library Services and Personnel . . . . . 20

Student Services . . . . . 20

Advisory Boards . . . . . 21

Technology . . . . . 22

**Problems Associated with Off-Campus Centers** . . . . . 24

**Off-Campus Center Trends** . . . . . 27

**Appendices** . . . . . 30

Methodology: Survey Design and Response . . . . . 30

Responding Institutions with Off-Campus Centers . . . . . 31

References for Additional Reading . . . . . 33

# Foreward

In 1990, NUCEA's Board of Directors initiated a new publication series focused on Organizational Issues in Continuing Higher Education. This initiative was based in part on the recognition that both internal and external forces are constantly challenging continuing education units to develop effective organizational systems for their diverse functions. It was also grounded in the Association's concern for highlighting and examining imaginative and creative approaches to structuring continuing education opportunities for a wide variety of learners.

This publication on off-campus centers responds to both of the series' goals. As the publication illustrates, off-campus centers have been developed in response to a range of internal and external forces, as well as to provide an organizational form to enhance educational access and to address specialized, local educational needs. Because *The Off-Campus Center* is based upon a survey of NUCEA institutions, it provides us a "map of the territory" about the use of this organizational form in continuing education. It also provides a wealth of practical advice about a range of topics, such as site selection, staffing, accreditation, and financing -- advice gleaned from the comments and responses of institutions and individuals with extensive experience with off-campus centers.

*The Off-Campus Center* is the second publication in NUCEA's organizational issues series. The Advisory Committee would like to thank Stanley Gabor and Jon Heggan for a practical, informative publication that continues in and extends the purposes for which the series was intended. We believe that you will find, as we have, *The Off-Campus Center* to be timely, well-written, and direct in addressing an issue of increasing importance in continuing education today.


### Advisory Committee on the Organizational Issues Publications Series

- Joe F. Donaldson, *Chair*, University of Missouri-Columbia
- Robert L. Bender, University of Illinois System
- Meta R. Braymer, Mary Washington College
- Thomas M. Hatfield, The University of Texas at Austin
- Thomas F. Kowalik, State University of New York-Binghamton
- Gary W. Matkin, University of California-Berkeley
- Kevin Talbert, Southern Oregon State College

# PREFACE

In spring 1993, the National University Continuing Education Association (NUCEA) decided, as part of its Organizational Issues Publication Series, to publish a monograph on "off-campus centers," and asked Johns Hopkins University to undertake the task.

How should the project be pursued? It was agreed by the Hopkins staff that the report should be concise, factual, and practical with primary focus on how to start, run, and maintain an "off-campus center." Readers of the monograph should not only gain a better understanding of the subject, but should also be exposed to concrete guidelines and examples of successful -- and not so successful -- endeavors.

Initial explorations showed that current research and statistics relating to "off-campus centers" were practically non-existent -- especially in light of recent interest in the area. It was decided that a general, overall survey of NUCEA institutions -- public and private -- was necessary and, in October 1993, a two-part questionnaire was mailed to the NUCEA membership. The results of this activity form the core of this monograph, and attempt to provide useful and constructive information for those planning to establish or expand initiatives "off campus." Other sections of this monograph revolve around the survey findings.

We would like to extend appreciation to Dr. William Kladky, consultant and SCS faculty associate, for his professional, collegial, and patient assistance in preparing, conducting, and analyzing the survey's questionnaire.

Acknowledgement must also go to Jan Moylan, director of SCS's Downtown Center, for preparing so well Johns Hopkins materials. The work of Elizabeth Mayotte, director of SCS's Columbia Center, was also evident during the project's many stages, with special thanks to her reporting on trends. The input of Pam Cranston, associate dean, relating to support services for students, faculty, and administrators must also be recognized.

Other SCS staff involved in the monograph are Renee Howatt, director of the Washington Center, and Rosel Halle, director of the Montgomery County Center. In addition, special thanks to Shirley Greenwald and Donna Murray for their fine word processing work and to Nancy Grund for production support.

A final word of appreciation must be extended to two Johns Hopkins' presidents -- Steven Muller and William C. Richardson -- whose extraordinary and enthusiastic support of continuing education and "off-campus" centers made this effort possible.

Stanley C. Gabor
Jon P. Heggan

## Introduction: The Off-Campus Center

Off-campus centers are playing an increasingly important role in continuing education today. More than ever, colleges and universities are offering credit and non-credit courses to thousands of adult, part-time learners at locations other than a main campus. Indeed, a recent NUCEA survey reported that 53 percent of all respondents cited "convenience of location" as the prime reason for enrolling in a particular institution.

Whether offered for career advancement or personal enrichment, programs are moving off campus to facilities and sites that have become extensions and satellites of colleges and universities. The trend is not only growing, but is becoming central to the mission of outreach now being embraced by many institutions through their continuing education divisions. With an historic commitment to teaching and service, these units have demonstrated remarkable ability, energy, and creativity that will continue to shape the changing role of higher education in the 21st century.

Historically, the purpose of an off-campus center was to take traditional university courses to convenient locations. In recent years, however, another trend has emerged that finds universities designing and providing special programs to meet an area's specific needs, such as biotechnology, technical management, teacher education, or public health services. In effect, colleges and universities are becoming more responsive to local, county, and regional economic development and cultural interests.

While program curriculum, cost, and accessibility are essential elements in the growth of off-campus centers, there are other economic, social, and psychological factors that are important to individuals considering "going back to school." Among these are the changing face of urban, suburban, and rural areas, the need to save time and minimize effort, security and safety, mode of transportation, facility amenities, and site image -- all part of the off-campus syndrome.

Taking these considerations into account, this monograph is designed for public and private colleges and universities wishing to explore the possibility of creating or expanding an off-campus center. The study discusses basic organizational issues that are typically encountered in the course of opening, managing, and closing a center. Survey data are presented in a way that is intended to respond to the interests, concerns, and questions of those who have responsibility for gathering the facts and making decisions.

After a brief statistical overview of location, enrollment, and physical characteristics of off-campus centers, survey results are utilized in an attempt attempt to answer such key questions as:

- Why establish an off-campus center?
- What factors influence site selection?

- What staffing needs are required?
- How is the facility marketed?
- What are on-going operational issues?
- What are expectations for financial self-sufficiency or income?
- What problems are associated with off-campus centers?
- Why do some facilities close?
- What are current trends?

The monograph's final section discusses the survey's methodology, lists responding institutions with off-campus centers, and provides a bibliography of relevant readings.

The study seeks to assist continuing education professionals and others, and help make their decision to go off-campus easier, sounder, and more successful.

## Definition of an Off-Campus Center

There are many types and definitions of an off-campus center. For the purposes of the monograph's survey, an off-campus center is defined as:

- a building, or space in a building, dedicated to an institution's on-going credit and/or non-credit programs,
- owned or rented, and administered by the university or school,
- physically separated from the main campus, but not a "branch" campus, and
- not an off-campus "site" on the premises of a company or business that is used exclusively to train employees.

# Location, Enrollments, and Physical Characteristics Of Off-Campus Centers

## Location

Off-campus centers are located in areas of every size -- from small towns of 5,000 to large urban metropolitan areas of many millions. The results of a 1993 survey of NUCEA member institutions show that an overwhelming 95 percent of the institutions with off-campus centers had at least one located in their own state, while 8 percent of the institutions had out-of-state facilities, and 6 percent had international centers (McCafferty, 1991). Private institutions' off-campus centers were twice as likely to be out-of-state (13 percent) and international (11 percent), reflecting the public institution's primary mission of providing education to citizens of its own state.

**Table 1. Location of Off-Campus Centers by Type**

| Location | Total | Public | Private |
|---|---|---|---|
| In-state | 72% | 88% | 50% |
| Out-of-state | 23 | 9 | 41 |
| International | 5 | 3 | 9 |

Off-campus centers are found mainly in urban areas:

**Table 2. Location of Off-Campus Centers by Population Area**

| | |
|---|---|
| Cities | 54% |
| Suburbs | 27 |
| Rural | 19 |

The different missions of private and public institutions influence the location of their off-campus centers. Private centers are more suburban -- and less likely to be urban -- than state-administered, off-campus centers. Public institutions also are more inclined to serve rural areas because of their mission to serve all citizens throughout a state regardless of location or financial consideration:

**Table 3. Location of Off-Campus Centers by Institutional Type**

| Location | Public | Private |
|---|---|---|
| Cities | 57% | 51% |
| Suburbs | 21 | 33 |
| Rural | 22 | 16 |

Off-campus centers are located in areas of every size—from small towns of 5,000 to large urban metropolitan areas of many millions:

**Table 4. Location of Off-Campus Centers by Population of Area**

| | |
|---|---|
| 0-49,999 | 30% |
| 50-99,999 | 11 |
| 100-399,999 | 30 |
| 400-999,999 | 17 |
| 1-3 million | 9 |
| Over 3 million | 3 |

There are no significant differences between public and private off-campus centers as they relate to population distribution.

## Enrollments (1992-93)

Off-campus center enrollments (credit and non-credit) are overwhelmingly part-time (91 percent). While full-time enrollment is predominantly credit (8 percent) compared to non-credit (1 percent), part-time enrollment is 55 percent credit and 36 percent non-credit:

**Table 5. Off-Campus Center Enrollment by Student Status**

| | Full-time | Part-time |
|---|---|---|
| Credit | 8% | 55% |
| Non-credit | 1 | 36 |

Enrollments differ significantly between public and private centers. Although both public and private facilities attract part-time students, private centers' part-time enrollment is preponderantly credit:

**Table 6. Enrollments by Institutional Type**

| | Public | Private |
|---|---|---|
| Part-time credit | 51% | 90% |
| Part-time non-credit | 49 | 10 |

## Physical Characteristics

The average size of the centers surveyed is 12,500 square feet. Because the calculation includes relatively large facilities (over 50,000 square feet), this figure somewhat distorts the true distribution of centers by size. For example, 41 percent of all facilities are less than 5,000 square feet and all together some 72 percent are under 15,000 square feet.

**Table 7. Off-Campus Center Size**

| | |
|---|---|
| Less than 5,000 sq. ft. | 41% |
| 5,000-14,999 sq. ft. | 31 |
| 15,000-24,999 sq. ft. | 10 |
| 25,000-34,999 sq. ft. | 6 |
| 35,000-49,999 sq. ft. | 4 |
| Over 50,000 sq. ft. | 8 |

The sizes of public and private centers differ markedly, as the average square footage of private facilities (14,300) is 25 percent larger than public ones (11,500).

**Table 8. Number of Classrooms in Off-Campus Centers**

| | |
|---|---|
| Less than 5 | 44% |
| 5-10 | 28 |
| 11-20 | 15 |
| 21-30 | 6 |
| 31-50 | 5 |
| Over 50 | 2 |

Off-campus centers contain a wide range of classrooms -- from one to more than 50, with an average of seven. This mean figure somewhat skews the true distribution because many centers (44 percent) have fewer than five classrooms, with only seven percent having more than 30. (The Survey did not inquire about classroom size.)

There are differences in the number of center classrooms below five in public and private off-campus centers; most public centers have two or three classrooms, while four or five are more prevalent in private centers.

Several institutions rent additional -- or fewer -- classrooms as their changing needs demand. When enrollment is up, more space is rented; when enrollment declines, rental space is decreased accordingly. The advantage is that renting institutions do not have to carry the extra space if their enrollments are down or flat. The negative is that they do not have control, and may not be able to add classrooms if the partner institution is also having a registration surge.

**Table 9. Off-Campus Center Facilities**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Administrative office space** | **87%** |
| **Food service/vending** | **64** |
| **Computer labs** | **59** |
| **Telecommunications linkages** | **56** |
| **Library facilities** | **44** |
| **Student lounge** | **38** |
| **Faculty office space** | **38** |
| **Faculty mailboxes** | **37** |
| **Research & information resources** | **32** |
| **Bookstore** | **29** |
| **Faculty lounge** | **20** |
| **Auditorium/lecture hall** | **19** |

Facilities at more than 50 percent of all off-campus centers include: administrative office space, food service/vending, computer labs, and telecommunications linkages. Those found at less than 30 percent of the centers are: bookstores, faculty lounges, and auditoriums.

There are notable differences in the use of space at public and private off-campus centers. Public centers offer more support activities -- especially administrative offices, bookstore, and telecommunications linkages -- than private centers (only faculty mailboxes are more numerous in private centers). This utilization of space is interesting given that private institutions occupy larger facilities. It appears that private centers primarily use their space for classrooms, while public centers favor greater variety of use.

## The Decision to Establish An Off-Campus Center

It is not surprising that "service to the community" was reported to be the most influential factor (86 percent) in an institution's decision to establish an off-campus center; indeed, 56 percent stated it was the most important consideration. Other important reasons cited were: the "potential for increased income" (49 percent), "local/state political considerations" (37 percent), and "university political considerations" (31 percent). Interestingly, comparatively few institutions named "lack of competition in new market" (13 percent) or "outgrowing main campus facilities" (12 percent) as significant.

**Table 10. Relative Importance of Diverse Factors in Establishing an Off-Campus Center**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Service to the community** | **86%** |
| **Potential for increased income** | **49** |
| **Local/state political considerations** | **37** |
| **University political considerations** | **31** |
| **Influence of business community** | **29** |
| **Gift of facility or space** | **18** |
| **Lack of competition in the new market** | **13** |
| **Outgrowing main campus facilities** | **12** |

However, factors cited by public and private institutions for establishing off-campus centers differ measurably. While both primarily mention "service to the community," 50 percent of the public centers said their second reason was "local/state political considerations," while private centers' second choice was "potential for increased income" (69 percent). This marked difference reflects the contrasting missions of these institutions. "Service to the community" is a large part of the mission of state funded schools. Income potential is very important to private institutions which are expected to realize a certain financial return from their off-campus center activities.

### Local/State Political Considerations

"Local/state political considerations" have motivated the establishment of many off-campus centers. This is particularly true for public facilities, but is also relevant for private institutions. In several states, a center was established simply to serve the educational needs of government workers; e.g., paraprofessional training at a state center (Western Montana College). More frequently, establishing a center serves a dual role, as a Midwestern state university director noted: "Service to state government and employees, and proximity to state office buildings."

The desire to be visible to the politically powerful is an especially strong motivation for state-funded universities. A large western state university center coordinator exclaims: "Close to the State Capital!" Another illustration is a consortium of universities and colleges that was formed to open and operate an educational center in Harrisburg, the capital of Pennsylvania.

Serving traditionally underserved populations and communities is another important reason for starting a public off-campus center. For example, state-funded Old Dominion University opened a center in Hampton Roads, Virginia, to reach an African-American population, and a large western state university developed an off-campus center to offer an Hispanic population access to its education programs.

## Changing Demographics

While the Survey found that the decision to create an off-campus center is frequently related to an institution's mission, several centers were established in response to changing target populations. Rapid urban population shifts appear to be responsible for several centers. An associate dean at a large, urban midwestern state university attributed the establishment of the institution's off-campus center to the "movement of the population away from the urban campus." Another reason for establishing an off-campus facility is to attract full-time students to the main campus. The director of a northeastern state university center reported that "off-campus graduate business programs serve as feeders to the main campus which is three miles away."

## Gift of Land

Some 18 percent of center directors reported that their centers were initiated as the result of a gift to the institution, in combination with other factors. A southern state university center director cited, "a gift of land; also important were local/state political considerations." Another, not uncommon impetus for establishing an off-campus center is an invitation to the institution to enhance adjacent commercial property. The inducement for an institution is a favorable rental rate, or even a building, whereas the landlord benefits from the presence and increased activity. For instance, the University of California-Los Angeles' Universal CityWalk Center is located within a convenient and highly attractive retail complex housing numerous shops, restaurants, and bookstores.

County governments, eager to attract and retain high technology employers, have also built special off-campus facilities for universities in order to ensure the availability of part-time graduate education opportunities. In the late 1980s, officials from Montgomery County -- a county adjacent to Washington, D.C., with one of the most affluent and highly educated populations in the

United States -- invited Johns Hopkins to locate in the County's Life Sciences Park and offered the institution 35 acres, plus $9 million for construction of a new education facility. During the first six years of the Johns Hopkins University Montgomery Center's existence, enrollments there in the School of Continuing Studies (SCS) graduate business and education programs grew from 500 in 1988 to 4,100 in 1994. Moreover, from the outset, SCS partnered with other Hopkins divisions to bring additional graduate degree opportunities in engineering, public health, and arts and sciences to students enrolled at the Center.

After witnessing the success of the Hopkins Montgomery County Center, the state of Maryland, together with private industry, the County, and the University of Maryland University College, raised money to build a second research and learning center in the Life Sciences Park for the University of Maryland System. As of 1994, the University of Maryland Center at Shady Grove had some 7,200 enrollments, divided evenly between the undergraduate and graduate programs, and six institutions in the System were offering degree programs at the Center.

# Start-Up of An Off-Campus Center

## Selection of the Site

The "cost of space" is the most crucial factor in site selection (Edwards, 1989). Two other reasons follow in importance: "image of location" and "ease of access to classrooms." Ranked low were "proximity to main campus" and, surprisingly, "safety":

**Table 11. Relative Importance of Diverse Site Selection Factors**

| | |
|---|---|
| Cost of space | 55% |
| Image of location | 44 |
| Ease of access to classrooms | 43 |
| Parking availability | 26 |
| Major transportation routes | 23 |
| Internal university politics | 20 |
| Visibility | 16 |
| Proximity of competition | 13 |
| Proximity to main campus | 7 |
| Safety | 6 |

Again, there are major differences between public and private off-campus centers. Public centers cited "internal university politics" as a consideration more often (27 to nine percent), while private centers mentioned "ease of access to classrooms" (51 to 37 percent) and "safety" (12 to two percent) as more important in site selection.

## Rental, Ownership, and Other Arrangements

A large majority of off-campus centers are housed in rented space. A smaller -- but significant -- number of centers are located in either rent-free space or on a military base. Ownership of a facility is not especially popular because of high financial costs and the commitment involved. As a result, less than 10 percent of all institutions are willing to make such a permanent, costly investment:

**Table 12. Center Real Estate Arrangements**

| | |
|---|---|
| Rented | 74% |
| Rent-free | 9 |
| On military base | 9 |
| Owned | 8 |

More public than private institutions own their off-campus centers:

**Table 13. Center Real Estate Arrangements by Institutional Type**

| | Public | Private |
|---|---|---|
| **Rented** | **70%** | **80%** |
| **Owned** | **12** | **3** |
| **Free** | **11** | **6** |
| **On military base** | **7** | **11** |

Two factors may explain the disparity in ownership: 1) private institutions indicate concern about minimizing fixed costs; and 2) private centers are more likely to be found in nontraditional locations (e.g., office buildings) which involve rental space.

## Space Sharing

**Table 14. Percentage of Centers Using Shared Space**

| | Number | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| **Share space** | **105** | **43** |
| **Do not share space** | **141** | **57** |

Although a majority of off-campus centers do not share space with another school of the same institution, a significant 43 percent do use shared space -- 53 percent of all public off-campus centers and 27 percent of all private centers.

Types of sharing arrangements for off-campus centers -- both public and private -- vary considerably. The major types include:

- **Linking with Divisions of the Same Institution**
  A growing number of off-campus centers conduct programs offered by divisions of the same university/institution. Because most schools administer credit and non-credit differently, each school often functions separately although the institution is the same.

- **The University and a Community College**
  A state university will share a center with a community college when programming is non-competitive. The four-year institution may be

invited to offer courses at a community college's campus, with several advantages: 1) access to community college classrooms and facilities, 2) greatly decreased space costs, and 3) reduced marketing costs. For example, all six of the off-campus centers of Pittsburg State University (Kansas) are on community college campuses that provide high-level support services.

### ■ The Multi-University Center

Another type of sharing arrangement is the multi-university center consortium, with institutions participating in classroom and administrative space, but doing their own programming and marketing. Most involve non-competitive programs, with each institution offering a specialized program of study. The Virginia Beach Center of Norfolk State University and Old Dominion University (Virginia) is an example of a cooperative effort in a booming growth area.

### ■ The Corporate Partnership

Several educational institutions have established full-fledged centers on the premises of a commercial organization rather than offer courses on-site to employees. For example, Alvernia College (Pennsylvania) runs its Pottstown campus in space provided by the Pennsylvania Business Institute, a for-profit organization.

## Staffing

Most centers have a director on-site, but nearly one-third of the centers -- 31 percent -- report having no full-time administrative staff in their off-campus centers. Forty-one percent indicated having between one and five full-time persons at a facility, and 28 percent noted they had six or more staff. Part-time staff are employed at 57 percent of the centers:

| No. of Staff | No. of Centers | % of Centers |
|---|---|---|
| 0 | 4 | 31 |
| 1 | 16 | 11 |
| 2 | 14 | 10 |
| 3 | 12 | 8 |
| 4 | 8 | 6 |
| 5 | 8 | 6 |
| 6 or more | 40 | 28 |

The director of a small eastern private university center typifies a common approach to staffing: "One of our nursing faculty has assumed the administrative duties at our off-campus site. We also employ one part-time secretary."

Attempts to minimize costs at off-campus centers can lead to a serious downside, however. Often, the quality of student support services will suffer. A western state university center coordinator relates: "This is a one-person, three-quarter time operation. I'm the only student adviser. That's a problem."

# Marketing an Off-Campus Center

## Market Assessment Activities

Approaches to marketing an off-campus center range from simply mailing catalogs to a complex process entailing market planning, research, and evaluation (Cistriano, 1990). While 18 percent of the institutions surveyed indicated that they had not been involved in any market assessment activities before establishing a center, most -- especially those moving into urban areas -- did pursue some type of marketing analysis. Many institutions reported employing one or more assessment activities, as Table 16, below, indicates:

**Table 16. Off-Campus Centers' Use of Market Assessment Activities**

| | |
|---|---|
| Demographic reports | 63% |
| Economic development reports | 56 |
| Assessment of competitive advantage | 52 |

Differences -- where they appear -- between the marketing activities of public and private off-campus centers are explained by the divergence in mission between the two types of institutions. Public centers utilized demographic surveys and economic development reports, while private centers were more likely to assess competitive advantage. In addition, a number of institutions reported undertaking surveys of current students.

## Initial Awareness Campaign

By a substantial margin, advertising and direct mail are the primary promotional tools utilized in the initial awareness campaign to promote a new off-campus center:

**Table 17. Off-Campus Centers' Use of Awareness Campaign Tools**

| | |
|---|---|
| Advertising | 38% |
| Direct mail | 29 |
| Open house | 9 |
| Other | 24 |

While private centers use advertising most frequently, public centers favor direct mail. Other types of marketing efforts include: Chamber of Commerce contacts; education fairs; high school visits; interviews with human resource directors; public service announcements; and speakers bureaus.

Because of start-up costs and financial constraints, most institutions approach the marketing effort conservatively, but use considerable creativity. Old Dominion University (Virginia), for example, involved consultants in the early marketing stage, believing that their added input not only improved the quality of decision making, but reassured concerned state education administrators that the impending move would succeed.

Off-campus center advisory boards also play an important role in the marketing process, with a significant 50 percent serving some kind of marketing and promotion function.

## Marketing Strategy

To differentiate off-campus center programs from their competitors, most institutions employ diverse course selection, various formats, and different scheduling:

**Table 18. Off-Campus Centers' Use of Diverse Marketing Techniques**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Diverse course selection** | **60%** |
| **Offering various formats** | **44** |
| **Scheduling different hours** | **40** |
| **Initiating location-specific programs** | **29** |
| **Providing special programs for business** | **29** |
| **Pricing to meet competition** | **19** |
| **Credit by examination** | **10** |

Overall, public centers report utilizing a greater variety of techniques than private centers. A number of respondents emphasized that their mission is to serve the educational needs of the community, rather than to compete with other higher education institutions. According to the regional director of a midwestern state university center: "Course selection, scheduling hours -- we seek to make more complete the offerings, not compete."

## Structural and Operational Issues

### Relationship to the Main Campus

**Table 19. Campus/Off-Campus Differences In Standards, Tuition, and Fees**

| | % of Institutions | Number |
|---|---|---|
| **Some difference** | **20** | **29** |
| **No difference** | **80** | **117** |

On average, only 20 percent of the institutions reported important administrative or academic differences between the main campus and the off-campus center. Slightly more private (26 percent) than public institutions (18 percent) reported variations of some kind. For all colleges and universities, the major area of difference between campus and off-campus is tuition and fees. The reasons for this vary.

For example, some out-of-state centers are required by state legislatures to be financially self-sufficient, and therefore, have higher tuition and fees than those charged for in-state, on-campus programs that are subsidized. As the dean at Southern Illinois University stated: "A program operated outside of Illinois must recover its full cost of operation as no state funds may be used to support the delivery of courses."

Some centers add special fees to cover the higher incidental costs of off-campus programs; e.g., increased faculty salaries, library support. Conversely, others charge reduced tuition for minorities with need, as reported by an urban midwestern state university.

Only a few institutions cited differences in admission standards between non-traditional, off-campus centers and the main campus. A southern private university dean represents this decidedly minority viewpoint: "The on-campus residential programs for 18-to-22 year olds have different 'admission' criteria from the adult programs (plus 25 years old)." In contrast, the great majority of respondents believed that standards for campus and off-campus programs were comparable -- observations consistent with research that generally has found similarity in the quality levels of the main campus and off-campus centers *(Wells, 1991; and Wilson, 1993).*

**Table 20. Off-Campus Center Use of Full and Part-Time Faculty**

| Faculty Status | Credit Courses | Non-Credit Courses |
|---|---|---|
| Full-time | 47% | 27% |
| Part-time | 53 | 73 |

The complex issue of utilizing full or part-time faculty at off-campus centers involves serious concerns relating to quality standards. While the traditional assumption is that off-campus center courses are predominantly taught by part-time instructors, the Survey found that these centers use only slightly more part-time (53 percent) than full-time (47 percent) faculty for credit courses. On the other hand, non-credit courses are far more likely to be taught by part-time instructors (73 percent).

**Table 21. Off-Campus Center Use of Full- and Part-Time Faculty by Type Institution**

| | Public | Private |
|---|---|---|
| Credit: | | |
| Full-time | 52% | 36% |
| Part-time | 48 | 64 |
| Non-Credit: | | |
| Full-time | 34% | 29% |
| Part-time | 66 | 71 |

## Accreditation

Regional accreditation guidelines, which often require comparability among sites, may be one reason why there are so few differences between on- and off-campus programs. For example, the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools/Commission on Higher Education (MSACS/CHE) requires that:

> "educational programs conducted off-campus, or special programs offered on-campus, [must] meet standards comparable to those of all other institutional offerings....Ultimately, the integrity and credibility of an institution's educational program rests directly on its acceptance of responsibility for all activities conducted in its name or under its sponsorship."
>
> —*Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education: Standards for Accreditation, 1987*

In addition to regional accreditation standards, many state governing bodies (e.g., Board of Regents) require off-campus programs to meet the same standards as do on-campus programs. For example, in Maryland, the state's Higher Education Commission's policy is as follows.

> "Campuses offering programs off-campus...must provide for adequate and appropriate library resources within reasonable distance of the instructional site. Students enrolled in off-campus instruction shall have access to academic support services equivalent to those provided to students enrolled in on-campus resident credit courses, including academic advising, counseling, library and other learning resources, and financial aid"
>
> —*Policies and Procedures for Academic Program Proposals for Degree-Granting Colleges and Universities, 1993*

## Financial Self-Sufficiency

More than half (56 percent) of the surveyed institutions require their centers to be financially self-sufficient:

**Table 22. Off-Campus Center Financial Self-Sufficiency Requirements**

| | % of Institutions | Number |
|---|---|---|
| **Not Required to be self-sufficient** | 44 | 64 |
| **Required to be self-sufficient** | 56 | 81 |

As might be expected, given their divergent missions, a much higher percentage of private (74 percent) than of public (50 percent) institutions had this mandate.

The amount of time allotted for new centers required to become self-sufficient varies considerably. This stems primarily from differences between the missions and roles of public and private institutions. While four-fifths of private institutions are required to be self-supporting within two years, only three-fifths of publics are under a similar constraint. Indeed, almost two-fifths of public institutions cite a longer time limit -- three or more years -- for self-sufficiency:

**Table 23. Institutional Time Frame for Off-Campus Center Self-Sufficiency**

| | Public | Private |
|---|---|---|
| **Immediately** | 33% | 14% |
| **Up to 1 year** | 14 | 25 |
| **1-2 years** | 14 | 40 |
| **2-3 years** | 27 | 14 |
| **Beyond 3 years** | 12 | 7 |

It is appropriate to note that 18 percent of institutions did not respond to this question indicating, perhaps, that the topic of financial self-sufficiency is somewhat sensitive.

**Tabel 24. Financial Status of Off-Campus Centers**

| | Percent | Number |
|---|---|---|
| Provides income above costs | 30 | 44 |
| Meets direct and indirect costs | 25 | 36 |
| Meets direct costs only | 30 | 43 |
| No response | 15 | 22 |

Survey findings suggest that the centers have decidedly different financial requirements. Less than one-third of the respondents reported that their center provides income above direct and indirect/overhead costs. Differences between public and private centers are especially striking:

**Table 25. Financial Status of Off-Campus Centers by Institutional Type**

| | Public | Private |
|---|---|---|
| Provides income above costs | 30% | 53% |
| Meets direct and indirect costs | 34 | 17 |
| Meets direct costs only | 36 | 30 |

Thirty-six percent of the responding institutions reported that a significant portion of their income (more than 15 percent) comes from their off-campus centers.

The associate dean of a large midwestern state university summarized the typical financial arrangement at many public institutions: "Our center is supported by a state appropriation. Tuition dollars are returned to the income fund (general revenue)." According to the dean of a large eastern state university: "Credit fees flow through institutional general accounts, while non-credit fees flow through continuing education accounts."

The implication is that public institution off-campus centers, in contrast to those of private institutions, do not have real incentives to make a profit on their credit operations since the revenue is often not returned to the continuing education unit. The reverse is true concerning non-credit income—a conclusion supported by differences in the non-credit/credit enrollment mix of public and private off-campus centers (see *Enrollments*, page 4).

## Library Services and Personnel

More than two-fifths (44 percent) of off-campus centers surveyed have some kind of library facility onsite. These vary widely, however, from a reading room with under 50 volumes to a fully-equipped library branch of the main campus' facility. Public institution centers (46 percent) are slightly more likely to have library facilities than those of private colleges and universities (41 percent).

Library personnel are engaged at only one-third (32 percent) of all off-campus centers. Staffing at private centers is less frequent (26 percent) than at public institutions (35 percent).

Library staffing at many centers is perceived as inadequate and helps to explain why 48 percent of private institutions and 46 percent of public institutions consider "access to library services" a serious problem at their off-campus facilities *(Anderson, 1992; Latham, 1991; and Kaiser and Herron, 1991).*

## Student Services

Off-campus centers are most likely to offer free parking, academic advising, textbook sales, and photocopying, while career planning and student transcripts are provided far less frequently.

**Table 26. Student Services Offered by Off-Campus Centers**

| Service | % of Centers |
|---|---|
| Free parking | 79 |
| Academic advising | 75 |
| Textbook sales | 57 |
| Photocopying | 56 |
| Microcomputer labs | 54 |
| Admission interview | 54 |
| Financial aid counseling | 41 |
| Security personnel | 38 |
| Food service | 33 |
| Library personnel | 32 |
| Career planning | 28 |
| Student transcripts | 14 |

The types of services offered on-site at public and private off-campus centers differ considerably. Thirty-five percent of the public institutions have library personnel as compared with 26 percent of the private institutions. However, 79 percent of the private institutions conduct admissions interviews at their off-campus centers as compared with only 37 percent of the public institutions. Similarly, 64 percent of the private institution off-campus centers offer financial aid counseling as compared with only 25 percent of the public centers.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Johns Hopkins University's Columbia Center illustrates the prominence that is sometimes given to student services at off-campus centers. In planning the facility, every effort was made to anticipate the expectations of its mainly working business and professional student population. The Center, which is strategically positioned near a major interstate midway between Baltimore and Washington, has spacious classrooms, networked computer laboratories, an electronic library, an executive conference room, and student and faculty lounges that were all designed to enhance the educational experience. In addition, the Center maintains a Career and Life Planning Center to provide -- without charge -- SCS students and alumni with career counseling and preparation for career transitions. As of 1994, the 15-year-old Center had eight full-time and four part-time administrators supporting some 5,500 credit enrollments annually.

## Advisory Boards

Advisory boards often assist the marketing effort of off-campus centers, in addition to performing such functions as reviewing new programs and recommending adjunct faculty. For many institutions, the involvement and support of an advisory board is a reflection of a center's quality and success *(Rosamond, 1986)*.

**Table 27. Prevalence of Off-Campus Center Advisory Boards**

| | % of Centers |
|---|---|
| Do not use advisory board | 71 |
| Do use advisory board | 29 |

Advisory boards perform several functions including: reviewing program offerings, heightening visibility, recommending new programs and assisting in marketing efforts. Boards can also help institutions with community relations, personnel reviews, and scholarship decisions, although these roles are less frequent.

**Table 28. Functions of Off-Campus Center Advisory Boards**

| Functions | % of Centers |
|---|---|
| Review program offerings | 75 |
| Provide center visibility | 68 |
| Recommend new programs | 67 |
| Market programs | 50 |
| Raise funds | 18 |

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

According to the survey results, 30 percent of the private institutions and 28 percent of the public institutions have advisory boards. Interestingly, public institution off-campus advisory boards generally perform a broader array of functions than those at private institution off-campus centers and consider fundraising to be a major activity.

While advisory boards often carry out multiple tasks, the most successful concentrate on a limited number of key activities. For example, at the downtown center of the University of Manitoba (Canada), the advisory board plays two critical roles: a) review of new programs, and b) provision of contacts for corporate educational contracting.

## Technology

Technology has become an increasingly important aspect of off-campus center academic and administrative activity. Many centers utilize advanced communications technology to facilitate communications between the off-campus center and the main campus in order to enhance the learning experience. While a majority -- 56 percent -- of institutions have some kind of telecommunications linkage, some 41 percent of all respondents deliver course instruction (or other type of education) via telecommunications.

**Table 29. Use of Telecommunications for Instruction by Off-Campus Centers**

| | % of Centers |
|---|---|
| **Utilize telecommunications** | 41 |
| **Do not utilize telecommunications** | 59 |

Public institutions lead in this area with two-thirds having telecommunications linkages as opposed to only two-fifths of private off-campus centers. Notably, more than 50 percent of the public centers use telecommunications to provide course instruction compared with 20 percent of their private counterparts.

## Microcomputer Labs

Availability of sufficient microcomputer labs is a critical issue relating to quality at off-campus centers. While 54 percent of the respondents said that they had microcomputer labs onsite, over 40 percent indicated that inadequate microcomputer facilities are a major problem. In fact, many off-campus centers consider it their most serious problem. This calls attention to a serious off-campus center dilemma -- the urgent need for technology-related courses and services and the lack of the financial resources needed to provide them. The

problem is compounded by the speed at which computer technology is progressing -- and the necessity for centers to adapt quickly and well to each successive advance in technology.

## Technology in the Future

It is safe to predict that development and utilization of technology at off-campus centers will continue to expand in the coming years. At present, however, use of technology is constrained by a lack of adequate support capital and administrative resources. In centers that employ technology, its effectiveness is often judged subpar relative to the growing needs of both students and administrators. This situation will become increasingly critical in the future, as the success and quality of off-campus centers will invariably depend upon telecommunications and distance learning.

## Problems Associated With Off-Campus Centers

According to survey respondents, the most serious problems that off-campus centers face are "too few classrooms," "lack of access to library services," and "inadequate computer labs." Seen as less important are "limited public transportation," "security," and "parking."

**Table 30. Relative Importance of Off-Campus Center Problems**

| Problems | % of Centers |
|---|---|
| Too few classrooms | 48 |
| Access to library services | 47 |
| Inadequate computer labs | 44 |
| Full-time faculty unavailable | 39 |
| Lack of student advisers | 32 |
| Parking | 28 |
| Security | 25 |
| Limited public transportation | 25 |

Public and private centers differed in two primary ways. First, more public than private institution centers appear to be experiencing major problems. Second, public and private respondents have differing views about which problems are most serious.

For public institutions, the greatest problems are:

- too few classrooms (53 percent)
- unavailability of full-time faculty (47 percent)
- lack of access to library services (46 percent)

Alternatively, private institutions cited the following problems:

- lack of access to library services (48 percent)
- inadequate computer labs (46 percent)
- too few classrooms (39 percent)

### The Issue of Quality

Concerns of quality are pervasive and persistent in the minds of some faculty who often equate off-campus centers with lower standards and inferior teaching. While administrative problems arise as to space, parking, and security, these difficulties are not as meaningful to "main campus" traditionalists as concerns about the use of full-time faculty, access to library services, and up-to-



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

date computer labs. What they seek is an *identical* educational experience -- which may not be possible or feasible -- instead of a *comparable* experience that emulates on-campus quality. The criteria for comparability include high-quality faculty (full-time and part-time), uniform admissions standards and advisement, adequate staffing, significant library resources, sensitivity to the needs of adult populations, and academic offerings that reflect the mission of the institution.

As universities move increasingly off campus, it is essential that they do not compromise standards of quality because of location and distance. On the contrary, there are many instances of an institution enhancing its purpose and role through outreach. Offering off-campus programs allows an institution to attract new and different audiences from expanding high-tech areas, growing regional populations, and active community organizations. An eastern private university, for example, has used its downtown facility to appeal to minority audiences that had historically found its main campus distant and uninviting. A nationally ranked liberal arts college utilizes its off-campus center to attract leading experts from the new area as part-time faculty (e.g., art historians, diplomats, scientists, and legislators) to supplement full-time faculty efforts. The result is a mix of faculty and students that enhances current programs -- and creates opportunities for new ones -- based upon the non-traditional interaction of location, faculty, and students.

Many off-campus facilities -- being relatively new -- are far superior to main campus space designed years ago for the traditional 18-to-22 year old student. Indeed, several survey institutions report that faculty prefer their off-campus facility to the main campus because it is more attractive and conducive to learning. To them, teaching at a modern, state-of-the art facility is more desirable than teaching at an antiquated main campus -- with limited parking!

Quality at off-campus centers will always be an important and continuing issue. It need not be, however, if viewed as an institution's extension or outreach that embraces and adheres to comparable -- not necessarily identical -- standards and goals. Quality is an academic and administrative state of mind that should not change because of distance or location. Having the reputation for quality on the main campus should not preclude the need to achieve it off campus.

## Why Centers Close

More than one-third of public and private institutions surveyed had closed an off-campus center, with the percentage significantly higher for private institutions. Some 50 percent of the latter have discontinued a center, compared to only 32 percent of their public counterparts.

While the cause for most closings was insufficient enrollment, other important reasons include:

■ **Urban Problems and Demographic Shifts.** The dean of a small midwestern private college attributed a center closing to "migration of traditional clients from center city to nearby suburban communities." Urban problems often accompany these demographic changes; e.g., the dean of a large eastern state university stated that it was necessary to close his center because it was "unworkable -- no parking in the inner-city, and faculty and students were unfavorably disposed to using the facility."

Sometimes institutions that remain downtown to help anchor a renewal area are eventually forced to leave because the expected turn-around never happens. UCLA closed its center near the Convention Center in fall 1992, and opened a new facility in early 1993 at the World Trade Center -- where it realized a 50 percent enrollment increase.

■ **Downturn in the Local Economy, Including Departure of Major Employers.** Northeastern University in Boston closed centers after Wang and Digital plants shut down operations. Colorado State University abandoned its Western Slope facility -- located 300 miles from its main campus -- when "Black Tuesday" shut down the oil industry.

■ **Military Base Closing or Reduction in Military Force (RIF).** The closing of a local air force base meant that Coastal Carolina University (South Carolina) was forced to discontinue its Myrtle Beach center.

■ **State-Mandated Changes in Geographical Coverage.** The Kansas Board of Regents established geographical jurisdictions for all Regents schools in 1975. As a result, the University of Kansas closed some of its centers.

■ **The Opening Nearby of Competing Institutions.** Private institutions that are challenged by state-subsidized community college and/or university competition having lower tuition are especially vulnerable. For example, a southeastern private university dean said that her center was doomed after a public community college located nearby. In retrospect, she believes that the university should have attempted to enter into a cooperative agreement with the community college.

■ **Insufficient Institutional Support.** Other centers close because of inadequate support from the main campus; e.g., the dean of a southern private college complained of "lack of institutional support and a sufficient number of suitable courses from the school's academic departments."

## Off-Campus Center Trends

The survey shows that off-campus centers effectively serve a dual purpose. They enable institutions to expand their outreach to a "wider community" and to address the changing educational needs of lifelong learners. In the next decade, the role of off-campus centers is expected to increase significantly as the same trends which propelled their growth over the past 10 years promise to continue at the current rapid pace.

Off-campus education in the future will both provide greater rewards to higher education institutions and their students, and offer new challenges and opportunities for continuing education professionals. While questions relating to site selection, marketing, and on-going administrative concerns will remain important, emerging issues of significance may include:

- involvement in the urban community
- utilization of distance learning technologies
- development of strategic alliances

### Enhancing Urban Communities

Survey data reveal that 86 percent of institutions consider "service to community" to be a critical factor influencing a decision to establish an off-campus center, and that more than half of the off-campus centers are located in cities. These two facts, combined with the growing urban crisis in America, suggest that urban centers may become focal points for linking higher education institutions with the urban community. Students and faculty will have opportunities to rebuild and strengthen the infrastructure of cities where education, health, economic development, and crime are of vital concern.

A growing number of universities are beginning to recognize the potential role of urban off-campus centers (Blake, 1992). New leadership programs for minority professionals and law enforcement executives, and collaborative efforts with urban redevelopment and "empowerment zone" projects demonstrate that increasing numbers of faculty and administrators understand the potential contributions of off-campus programs designed to make the city a better place in which to live and work.

### Exploring Alternative Delivery Modes

Off-campus centers constitute one approach used by institutions to deliver education at locations other than a main campus. Public institutions, which often are mandated to provide statewide service, have a long history of establishing

centers in rural, sparsely populated areas, whereas private university off-campus centers are more frequently found in urban areas. In addition, private institutions have historically been able to move across state and regional boundaries with greater ease than public institutions.

Survey results indicate that an increasing number of institutions are experimenting with alternative delivery systems to reach a wider "community" or audience. Information and telecommunications technologies enable institutions to deliver their courses and support services to students at off-campus facilities, at their places of work, or in their homes (Tress, 1992). Among the Survey respondents, 56 percent of centers have some type of telecommunications linkage, and 41 percent offer education programs electronically.

There is little doubt that off-campus center use of the new technologies will grow. At the same time, the ability to provide access to global information resources electronically will prompt institutions to consider whether an investment in technology or an investment in a new off-campus center would represent the most efficient use of resources. Some small institutions may find their survival threatened in an era of telecommunications unless they can forge partnerships with other institutions.

## Expanding Strategic Alliances

Flexibility has been a hallmark of the off-campus centers since their inception. In the coming years, this characteristic will become even more crucial. The Survey shows that 43 percent of all off-campus centers are shared facilities and that their arrangements are varied. In some cases, a center links two divisions of one university; while other centers house lower division courses offered by a community college and upper division courses offered by a neighboring university. Another arrangement allows different universities to collaborate in one shared facility.

Sometimes strategic alliances, such as those depicted, are easy to structure, especially when state educational policy supports or mandates them. The next decade may call on institutions to make even more dramatic alliances with K-12 school systems, professional associations, and higher education consortia. Colleges and universities may also become more closely affiliated with business organizations or "corporate universities." In addition, state and local governments and various library systems may present opportunities to create consortia that call for shared physical space in an off-campus center, or shared electronic resources off campus.

In the midst of tremendous economic and technological change, it is clear that electronic information is everchanging and expensive, and will call for new alliances and creative partnerships to share scarce resources.

## The Future of Off-Campus Centers

For many years, off-campus centers have enabled colleges and universities to attract students who might otherwise not have been able to access their educational programs. Today, advanced information and telecommunication technologies have greatly expanded the reach of institutions. Students can now take courses at home or in the work place using electronic delivery systems. Moreover, prospective students may select from a wide range of courses offered electronically by diverse higher education institutions -- both in- and out-of-state. The challenge for the consumer in the current distance learning environment is one of differentiating among an abundance of educational resources in terms of content, cost, convenience, and quality.

Distance learning will not eliminate the need of students and faculty to meet face-to-face and interact with each other. In fact, increased use of distance learning could support the development of off-campus centers. The reasons why much of continuing education's recent activity and growth has occurred off campus are *location* and *convenience*. While instructional telecommunications may provide even greater convenience to some individuals, strategically located off-campus centers will still be needed. Not all courses can be converted effectively to a distance learning mode. Moreover, both students and faculty value the quality of interaction that occurs in a traditional classroom setting. What can be anticipated is that many off-campus sites will become not only "live" extensions of the main campus, but also centers where students can access certain courses and student services electronically.

# Appendix A

## Methodology: Survey Design and Response

In October 1993, a questionnaire was sent to the NUCEA membership requesting information on off-campus centers. Of the 400 institutions that were sent a survey, 290 -- or 73 percent -- responded. Although 132 indicated "no" off-campus center, 158 -- or 55 percent -- reported having at least one and, of these, 100 listed two or more.

The NUCEA-Hopkins survey of off-campus centers included two parts. The first, an "All Centers" questionnaire, was designed to be completed by a continuing education school's central administrative unit. It involved overall questions relating to start-up, physical characteristics, administrative support services, academic and administrative issues, and financial concerns associated with all of the institution's centers. The second, an "Individual Center" questionnaire, was designed for the director or manager of an individual off-campus center, with emphasis on that center's experience, including its marketing and community involvement. Each questionnaire contained a combination of direct answer, multiple choice, and open-ended questions. The survey was pre-tested by senior university continuing education deans and the staff of NUCEA.

The two-part questionnaire was mailed to all NUCEA member institutions in October 1993. The first, entitled "All Centers," was sent to the institutional NUCEA contact person, who was in a school's central administration. In addition, six copies of the second part "Individual Center" survey were included, with directions asking the central administration contact to have all individuals who run off-campus centers complete them. A follow-up letter was mailed in November to those institutions that had not responded, urging their participation. The final completed surveys were received in January 1994.

A set of follow-up telephone interviews was conducted with a selected sample of respondents during January and February 1994 to elicit illustrations, elaborations, or explanations of their survey figures and comments.

**NOTE**: Several Survey findings show percentages that add up beyond 100 percent due to multiple responses to a question (e.g., "what were the three most influential factors?"). Also, not all center additions total the 158 responding institutions as a number of respondents chose not to answer certain questions.

# Appendix B

## Responding Institutions with Off-Campus Centers (158)

Alvernia College
Arizona State University
Auburn University
Auburn University-Montgomery
Barry University
Bethune-Cookman College
Brigham Young University
California State University
California State University-Chico
California State University-Long Beach
California State University-San Bernardino
Central Michigan University
Central Washington University
Chapman University
Clayton State College
Coastal Carolina University
Colegio Universidad del Este
College of Charleston
Colorado State University
Columbia College
Delaware State University
Delaware Valley College
DePaul University
East Carolina University
Eastern Kentucky University
Eastern Oregon State College
East Tennessee State University
Eckerd College
Elizabethtown College
Embry-Riddle University
Florida Atlantic University
Florida State University
Franklin Pierce College
Governors State University
Hadley School for the Blind
Idaho State University
Indiana University
Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Jackson State University
Johns Hopkins University
Lamar University-Beaumont
Lincoln Graduate Center
Lincoln University
Louisiana State University-Shreveport
Loyola College
Maryland Institute College of Art
Memphis State University
Mesa State College
Michigan State University
Murray State University
National University
New York University
Northeastern University
Northern Arizona University
Northern Illinois University
Northern Michigan University
Northern State University
Oklahoma State University
Old Dominion University
Pittsburg State University
Portland State University
Purdue University
Purdue University North Central
Quad-Cities Graduate Study Center
St. Leo College
St. Thomas Aquinas College
St. Xavier University
Samford University
San Francisco State University
Sangamon State University
San Jose State University
Slippery Rock University
Somerset Community College
Southern Illinois University-Edwardsville
Southern Oregon State College
SUNY-Stony Brook
Syracuse University
Temple University
Tennessee Technological University
Texas Christian University
Texas Tech University
Universidad Autonoma de Guadalajara
Universidad del Turabo
Universite de Montreal
University of Alabama
University of Alabama-Birmingham
University of Alaska-Anchorage
University of Arizona
University of Arkansas-Fayetteville
University of Arkansas-Little Rock

## Appendix B

### Responding Institutions with Off-Campus Centers (158) *...continued*

University of British Columbia
University of California
University of California-Berkeley
University of California-Los Angeles
University of California-Santa Cruz
University of Central Florida
University of Cincinnati
University of Delaware
University of Denver
University of Detroit-Mercy
University of District of Columbia
University of Georgia
University of Hartford
University of Hawaii-Hilo
University of Illinois-Chicago
University of Illinois-Urbana
University of Indianapolis
University of Kansas
University of Kentucky
University of Manitoba
University of Maryland
University of Massachusetts-Boston
University of Miami
University of Minnesota
University of Mississippi
University of Missouri
University of Missouri-St. Louis
University of Montana
University of Nebraska-Omaha
University of New Hampshire
University of New Mexico
University of New Orleans
University of North Dakota
University of Northern Colorado
University of North Florida
University of Rhode Island
University of San Francisco
University of South Carolina-Aiken
University of South Dakota
University of Southern Colorado
University of Tennessee-Knoxville
University of Tennessee-Martin
University of Texas-Austin
University of Texas Health Center
University of Utah
University of Vermont
University of Virginia
University of Washington
University of Windsor
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
University of Wyoming
Utah State University
Valdosta State University
Vincennes University
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Walsh College of Accounting and Business Administration
Washington State University
Wayne State University
Weber State University
Western Carolina University
Western Illinois University
Western Kentucky University
Western Michigan University
Western Montana College
West Georgia College
West Virginia Graduate College
West Virginia University
Wilmington College

# Appendix C

## References for Additional Reading

**Anderson, Karen**, "Extended Campus Library Services: Proactive Guidelines and Planning for System Evaluation," in *Quality in Off-Campus Credit Programs: Theory and Practice*, Proceedings of October 21-23, 1991, Conference (Manhattan, Kansas: Kansas State University, 1992): pp. 1-7.

Important issues in preparing to serve the community; "Adjunct campuses are often among the first to see it, and among the first expected to respond" (p. 5). Advocates use of ACRL Guidelines for Extended Campus Library Services.

**Blake, Elizabeth D.**, "Downtown Continuing Higher Education Centers: An Overview and Case Study Examination." Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Maryland College Park, 1992.

Results of a survey of a sample of 54 education centers with downtown locations. Some findings were: 75 percent were in operation under 12 years, primary establishment reasons included social commitment to cities, desire for visible presence, and aid to economic development.

**Blakely, Thomas J.**, "Delivering an Off-Campus Program: A Descriptive Review," in *Quality in Off-Campus Credit Programs: Service, Strategies, and Successes*, Proceedings of November 12-14, 1990, Conference (Manhattan, Kansas: Kansas State University, 1991): pp. 45-50.

Description of the graduate off-campus program in social work at Western Michigan University (program evaluation criteria, administrative and support services).

**Breyman, Gustave**, "Off-Campus Advising: Serious Business," in *Quality in Off-Campus Credit Programs: Bridging the Distance*, Proceedings of October 19-21, 1992, Conference (Manhattan, Kansas: Kansas State University, 1993): pp. 57-65.

Discussion of advisement issues involving Master of Public Administration students at the Regional Education Center of Western Michigan University. Includes a 12-step model for successful off-campus advising.

**Cistriano, Jack**, "Marketing Off-Campus Programs for Traditional and Non-Traditional Students," in *Quality in Off-Campus Credit Programs: Services, Strategies, and Successes*, Proceedings of November 12-14, 1990, Conference (Manhattan, Kansas: Kansas State University, 1991): pp. 63-70.

Description of the marketing program of Chesapeake College (Maryland): minority recruitment, direct mail, scholarship program, regional college night, outreach events, and advertising/promotion.

**Commission on Higher Education, Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools**, *Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education: Standards for Accreditation*. Commission on Higher Education (Philadelphia, PA, 1987): p.17.

**Commission on Higher Education, Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools**, *Off-Campus Programs, Guidelines for Self-Assessment And Peer Evaluation* (Philadelphia, PA, 1990).

*Guidelines for Self-Assessment and Peer Evaluation* may be obtained by writing or calling the Middles States Association of Colleges and Schools/Commission on Higher Education, 3624 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104, (215) 662-5606.

**East, James R.**, "Teaching in the Marketplace," *Journal of Continuing Higher Education*, 36 (Spring, 1988): 2-5.

Description of successful Learn and Shop College Credit Program of Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis which utilizes five major shopping centers. Beginning in 1979, the Program demonstrates a close instructor/student relationship and a natural environment for learning.

**Edwards, James L.**, "Building an Off-Campus Center on a Shoestring," in *Quality in Off-Campus Programs: Challenges for Innovation*, Proceedings of October 24-26, 1988, Conference (Manhattan, Kansas: Kansas State University, 1989): p. 129-134.

Description of the planning and start-up of the Western Center of Butler County Community College (Kansas), including needs analysis, site selection criteria, and budget development.

**Freeman, Joan W.**, "Growing Pains: The Development of an Off-Campus Center," in *Quality in Off-Campus Credit Programs: Bridging the Distance*, Proceedings of October 19-21, 1992, Conference (Manhattan, Kansas: Kansas State University, 1993): pp. 144-147.

History and description of the start-up experience of the Dublin Center of Columbus State Community College (Ohio): decision making process, student surveys, providing services, and evaluation.

**Gabor, Stanley C.** et. al., *A Policy Statement: Off-Campus Graduate Education.* Washington, D.C.: Council of Graduate Schools, 1989.

A general guide and issues discussion that includes definitions of off-campus terms, graduate dean roles, responsibility to the community, academic guidelines, and key questions for administrators.

**Grieder, Timothy M.**, et. al., "A National Study of State Control and Institutional Autonomy in Off-Campus Programs," *Journal of Continuing Education*, 50 (Autumn, 1986): pp. 125-135.

Results of a 1985 survey of state higher education agencies: half the states have established statewide policies regarding admission criteria and graduation off-campus (p. 129), most states have not adopted more than general policies (p. 135), and "off-campus programs appear to be considered a natural extension of institutions' programs rather than unique or independent programs..." (p. 135).

**Kaiser, John R., and Nancy L. Herron**, "Library Resources and Services for Quality Off-Campus Programs: The Penn State Experience," in *Quality in Off-Campus Credit Programs: Service, Strategies, and Successes*, Proceedings of November 12-14, 1990, Conference (Manhattan, Kansas: Kansas State University, 1991): pp. 125-128.

Discussion of history and administrative issues in off-campus library site establishment: need for main campus commitment, adequate support service provision, adherence to ACRL standards.

**Latham, Sheila**, et. al., *Library Services for Off-Campus and Distance Education: An Annotated Bibliography*. Ottawa, Ontario: Canadian Library Association, 1991.

Description and documentation of 535 individual works by 443 authors from 21 different countries written between 1930 and 1990. Highest frequency: roles of libraries in distance education (105), library case studies (81), interlibrary cooperation (50), user studies (46).

**Maryland Higher Education Commission**, *Policies and Procedures for Academic Program Proposals for Degree-Granting Colleges and Universities*, (Annapolis, MD, 1993): p. 17.

**McCafferty, Arthur N.**, "Establishing an International Business Site: A Strategy," in *Quality in Off-Campus Credit Programs: Service, Strategies, and Successes*, Proceedings of November 12-14, 1990, Conference (Manhattan, Kansas: Kansas State University, 1991): pp. 163-168.

Description of necessary steps to establish a successful international business site: market understanding, site selection, program mix, and media/promotion development.

**Rosamond, Julia**, "Community Linkage: An Advisory Council for Off-Campus Programs," *Journal of Continuing Education*, 50 (Autumn, 1986): pp. 137-141.

Description of a successful effort to form an "off-campus" advisory board at the University of Tennessee-Knoxville: objectives, roles, organizational structure, and evaluation after four years of operation.

**Tress, Michael L.**, et. al., "Advising the Off-Campus Learner via Computerized Conferencing," in *Quality in Off-Campus Credit Programs: Bridging the Distance*, Proceedings of October 19-21, 1992, Conference (Manhattan, Kansas: Kansas State University, 1993): pp. 294-300.

Description of the utilization of computerized conferencing (accessed via Internet or Bitnet) to supplement in-person advising at the 10 off-campus sites of the New Jersey Institute of Technology.

**Wells, John H.**, "Staff Development - A Key to Quality in Off-Campus Credit Programs," in *Quality in Off-Campus Credit Programs: Service, Strategies, and Successes*, Proceedings of November 12-14, 1990, Conference (Manhattan, Kansas: Kansas State University, 1991): pp. 249-254.

Discussion of the critical importance of staff development in off-campus programs.

**Wilson, P. Craig**, "Faculty and Student Perceptions of Quality: A Comparison of On-Campus and Off-Campus Graduate Programs," in *Quality in Off-Campus Credit Programs: Bridging the Distance*, Proceedings of October 19-21, 1992, Conference (Manhattan, Kansas: Kansas State University, 1993): pp. 317-322.

Results of a 1991 survey conducted at the Hampton Roads Center of George Washington University (Washington, D.C.): off-campus students gave higher quality rankings to the same courses than did on-campus students; there was no difference in the overall perceived quality of instruction; and there was a perception of high quality both on- and off-campus.

**Zoch, Darrell**, "Building Community Based Personnel and Financial Support for Off-Campus Programs," in *Quality in Off-Campus Credit Programs: Examining the Issues, Influences, and Innovations*, Proceedings of October 23-25, 1989, Conference (Manhattan, Kansas: Kansas State University, 1990): pp. 299-303.

Discussion of off-campus administrative structures and processes at Northwest Iowa Technical College, including promotional efforts.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

nucea

National University Continuing Education Association